REMARKS

The present Amendment cancels claims 1 and 7, and amends claims 2-6. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 2-6.

Support for Amendments

The amendments to the claims are supported, for example, in the specification at page 7, line 28 (i.e., paragraph [0013] of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0117506 ("PG Publication") of the present application), and page 2, line 11 to page 3, line 6 (i.e., paragraph [0004] of the PG Publication of the present application).

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the interview conducted on December 16, 2008. In the interview, arguments were presented to overcome the cited references, particularly Levosky and Saito. The Examiner indicated that Applicants' arguments regarding the claims appeared to overcome the relied-upon references. However, the Examiner indicated that further search and consideration would be required. In this response, Applicants have reiterated the arguments presented to the Examiner for the interview.

Preliminary Matters

As a preliminary matter, however, it is noted that the Examiner has not indicated which portions of Levosky are relied upon to support the rejection of claims 2 and 3, which makes it difficult for Applicants to be fully apprised of the Examiner's reasons for rejection. For example, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 4 of the Office Action. As described in paragraph 8, the Examiner makes reference to "claim 1". However, claim 1 was withdrawn from further consideration. Furthermore, it appears as if the Examiner merely cut and paste the text of claims 2 and 3, asserting that Levosky teaches the subject matter of claim 2, without providing any

support for the assertion that Levosky teaches the claimed features. Accordingly, if the Examiner continues to rely upon Levosky, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide specific citations to the portions of Levosky relied upon to support the rejection.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner. Where appropriate, Applicants have amended either the claims or the specification to overcome this objection. Therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,054,906 to Levosky. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 2 and 3, are not taught or suggested by Levosky, whether taken individually or in combination any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Specifically, amendments were made to the claims to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to a third information processing apparatus as recited, for example, in independent claims 2 and 3.

The present invention, as recited in claim 2, and as similarly recited in claim 3, provides a third information processing apparatus. The third information processing apparatus includes a global Internet Protocol (IP) address pool including rent-out global IP addresses, and correspondence information having a correspondence relationship between an original global IP address and a rent-out global IP address. According to the present invention, the original global IP address is allocated to a

first information processing apparatus, and the rent-out global IP address is set to the first information processing apparatus by the third information processing apparatus.

According to the present invention, as recited in claim 3, the second information processing apparatus is a partner information processing apparatus with which the first information processing apparatus performs communication using the rent-out global IP address. The prior art does not disclose all of the above-described features.

The above-described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record, particularly Levosky, whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record.

Levosky teaches a system and method for controlling and organizing email. There is no teaching or suggestion in Levosky of the third information processing apparatus as recited in claims 2 and 3 of the present invention.

Levosky discloses a method implemented in a standard email system. The email system includes a client computer that contains a physical email address and an email server. A client control program, which resides on the client computer and an alias email server, which communicates with the client over the data communications network, are added. The method includes entering the physical email address into the client control program, together with client identification information. The alias email server then generates an alias email address, which is communicated back to the user, and additionally is stored in the alias email server. The client then makes the alias email address available to selected correspondent. Response emails are intercepted by the alias email server, and either forwarded to the client, filtered, or blocked. The client is provided with a log of all transactions,

including the time and date, alias email addresses, and other user-created information.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 2, and as similarly recited in claim 3, includes a global Internet Protocol (IP) address pool including rent-out global IP addresses. Levosky does not disclose this feature.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 2, and as similarly recited in claim 3, includes correspondence information having a correspondence relationship between an original global IP address and a rent-out global IP address, where the original global IP address is allocated to a first information processing apparatus, and where the rent-out global IP address is set to the first information processing apparatus by the third information processing apparatus. Levosky does not disclose this feature.

Nonetheless, Applicants submit that the above described combination of features of the present invention are not taught or suggested by Levosky. In the present invention, the addresses recited in the claims refer to IP addresses. Levosky is directed to a system that hiding a user's email address from another user. Levosky's disclosure regarding email addresses is quite different from the present invention, which is directed to the use of IP addresses.

Therefore, Levosky fails to teach or suggest "a global Internet Protocol (IP) address pool including rent-out global IP addresses" as recited in claim 2, and as similarly recited in claim 3.

Furthermore, Levosky fails to teach or suggest "correspondence information having a correspondence relationship between an original global IP address and a rent-out global IP address, wherein said original global IP address is allocated to a first information processing apparatus, and wherein said rent-out global IP address is

set to said first information processing apparatus by said third information processing apparatus" as recited in claim 2, and as similarly recited in claim 3.

Therefore, Levosky does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention, as recited in claims 2 and 3. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 2 and 3 as being anticipated by Levosky are respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references used in the rejection of claims 2 and 3.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Levosky in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,317,798 to Saito. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in claims 4-6, are not taught or suggested by Levosky or Saito, whether taken individually or in combination with each other in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, they are dependent on claim 3. Therefore, claims 4 and 5 are allowable for at least the same reasons previously discussed regarding independent claim 3.

Regarding the remaining claim 6, amendments were made to claim 6 to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Specifically, amendments were made to claim 6 to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to a second information processing apparatus as recited, for example, in independent claim 6.

The present invention, as recited in claim 6, provides a second information processing apparatus. The information processing apparatus includes a transmitter that transmits an inquiry with encrypted communication about an original global Internet Protocol (IP) address of the first information processing apparatus to a third information processing apparatus having correspondence information. According to the present invention, the correspondence information has a correspondence relationship among the original global IP address of the first information processing apparatus, a rent-out global IP address set to the first information processing apparatus, and a global IP address of the second information processing apparatus. The prior art does not teach or suggest all of these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record. Specifically, the features are not taught or suggested by either Levosky or Saito, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

As previously discussed, Levosky teaches a system and method for controlling and organizing email. There is no teaching or suggestion in Levosky of the second information processing apparatus as recited in claim 6 of the present invention.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 6, includes a transmitter that transmits an inquiry with encrypted communication about an original global Internet Protocol (IP) address of the first information processing apparatus to a third information processing apparatus having correspondence information, where the correspondence information has a correspondence relationship among the original global IP address of the first information processing apparatus, a rent-out global IP address set to the first information processing apparatus, and a global IP

address of the second information processing apparatus. Levosky does not disclose this feature.

As previously discussed, the addresses of the present invention, as recited in the claims, refer to IP addresses. Unlike the present invention, Levosky is directed to a system that hiding a user's email address from another user. Levosky's disclosure regarding email addresses is quite different from the present invention, which is directed to the use of IP addresses.

Therefore, Levosky fails to teach or suggest "a transmitter that transmits an inquiry with encrypted communication about an original global Internet Protocol (IP) address of said first information processing apparatus to a third information processing apparatus having correspondence information, wherein said correspondence information has a correspondence relationship among said original global IP address of said first information processing apparatus, a rent-out global IP address set to said first information processing apparatus, and a global IP address of said second information processing apparatus" as recited in claim 6.

The above noted deficiencies of Levosky are not supplied by any of the other references of record, namely Saito, whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Therefore, combining the teachings of Levosky and Saito in the manner suggested by the Examiner still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Saito teaches a communication processing system, method and program. There is no teaching or suggestion in Saito of the second information processing apparatus as recited in claim 6 of the present invention.

Saito discloses a communication processing system, which allows a secure communication with a mobile terminal via a network. The communication processing system includes a server which provides a common key used to encrypt and decrypt

data transmitted between communication terminals, and provides information about locations of communication terminals on the network. The server generates a session key and provides it to communication terminals. The server has a database in which location information of mobile terminals is stored. If the server receives, from a calling terminal, data designating a destination terminal, the server searches the database using an IP address of the destination terminal as a search key to acquire the latest location information of the destination terminal, and the server transmits encrypted data including a session key and address data of the destination terminal to the calling terminal.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 6, includes a transmitter that transmits an inquiry with encrypted communication about an original global Internet Protocol (IP) address of the first information processing apparatus to a third information processing apparatus having correspondence information, where the correspondence information has a correspondence relationship among the original global IP address of the first information processing apparatus, a rent-out global IP address set to the first information processing apparatus, and a global IP address of the second information processing apparatus. Saito does not disclose this feature.

Saito is directed to a system where a server manages information regarding keys used in encrypted communications. Saito's disclosure regarding keys used in encrypted communications is quite different from the present invention, which is directed to the use of IP addresses.

Therefore, Saito fails to teach or suggest "a transmitter that transmits an inquiry with encrypted communication about an original global Internet Protocol (IP) address of said first information processing apparatus to a third information processing apparatus having correspondence information, wherein said

correspondence information has a correspondence relationship among said original global IP address of said first information processing apparatus, a rent-out global IP address set to said first information processing apparatus, and a global IP address of said second information processing apparatus" as recited in claim 6.

Both Levosky and Saito suffer from the same deficiencies, relative to the features of the present invention, as recited in the claims. Therefore, combining the teachings of Levosky and Saito in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 4-6 as being unpatentable over Levosky in view of Saito are respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references used in the rejection of claims 4-6.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 2-6 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 2-6 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing Attorney Docket No. 500.42924X00).

Respectfully submitted,
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

/DONNA K. MASON/
Donna K. Mason
Registration No. 45,962

DKM/jab